Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*

Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066

VOL. VII, No. 24, *Issue Number* 333, JUNE 14, 1950 *Editor:* FRANK C. HANIGHEN

UNIVERSITY OF MINN. RECEIVED JUN 19 1950

TILL WE HAVE BUILT JERUSALEM

by Edna Lonigan

There has been a surprisingly widespread suggestion, even in the New Deal press, that our diplomacy has now lost Western Europe. And with Europe we must include Africa. If there is to be a duel between the United States and the Soviet Union, Western Europe wants none of it.

Mr. Acheson is trying to "sell" a foreign policy, alien to American traditions, on the ground that it is necessary to fight Communism. But the fact is that only a return to our great traditions will help in rolling back the Communists. Europeans can wage a cold war without our interference. What they want of us is help in building a New World.

We must build a new foreign policy geared, as our foreign policy used to be, to opening a road to peace. "Peace" is not primarily a relationship with other countries, but a relation of the parts to the whole within each country. In war, the whole nation is mobilized, on the pattern of the army, where order is obtained by force from above. True peace is insured when the nation is organized on the pattern of the village, where neighboring families work together, as need arises, by mutual consent.

War conditions people to manic overstimulation. Work is speeded up, money is inflated. All this effort is harnessed to the wills of a few men at the center. The trouble is that, after the war against the external enemy is over, these men do not like to surrender their power. They look for new excuses to harness the devotion that makes war possible, and so keep power and wealth flowing into their hands.

Every war, then, is followed by a political crisis. The army within must be demobilized, so that the people may return to the simple natural relations of the "village" State. Modern war, being the total manipulation of people, of work, of money and of ideas, is followed by a total political crisis. Every device of regimentation, and propaganda, which had been used to whip up people's energies against the foreign enemy in war is now used by rulers in the post-war period to keep dominance over their own people, still numbed from their unnatural efforts. The problem of the period after a great war is moral -- it is the problem of strengthening the will of the people to take up the burdens of self-government and to dismantle the Leviathan built in their name.

Copyright 1950 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II

The American tradition is to a marked extent the offshoot of Elizabethan England. Elizabeth's father had murdered her mother, and her older sister had put Elizabeth in jail in constant danger of execution. She came to a troubled throne with an intense dislike of fighting. The other countries of Europe were governed by headstrong ambitious rulers, engaged in frequent wars, and eager to draw her in. She chose peace, and built the foundations of over 300 years of progress.

Elizabeth did not keep England out of war by talking about peace. She was far too intelligent. Neither did she have a Voice of Brittania telling the poor peasants of France how wonderful England was. She stayed out of war by winning a continuous battle of wits with the cleverest men in Europe. Her northern border was exposed to invasion by the French, and her coast by the Spaniards, but she refused to let England be tied down by alliances. As Professor Borchard said of George Washington's foreign policy, "splendid isolation" meant that England kept the initiative. Elizabeth signed no blank checks, made no commitments for an uncertain future.

The English nation was not isolated. Never had it had so many contacts with the great world. But instead of sending armies to foreign countries, Elizabethan England sent sea-captains and traders. Instead of dealing as government to government, like Spain and France, England used person to person relationships in overseas trade and exploration. The result was a great outflow of the energy of private citizens. The strongest influence on American history came from that historic rush toward free individual enterprise in place of the deceiving glamor of pomp and war. When Jefferson later spoke of "the social power of the American people", he meant the great release of energy when private citizens are free of the restraints of a ruling class.

The English people kept the money which in Spain and France the kings were wasting on arms. Thus many Englishmen had bits of capital which they invested in long dangerous voyages to the Baltic or the New World. It makes a crucial difference whether the wealth of a nation is increasing faster than its population, or lagging behind, because the smallest gain or loss is compounded annually. England's tiny margin of gain under Elizabeth's far-sighted policy made it possible in the following century for the English to win North America. Without this growth of private wealth the English people would not have been able to wage war against the Stuarts, and re-establish representative government, to be carried to even greater heights in the American Constitution.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

III

In the same two centuries the Continental nations, engaged in constant war, modelled their political institutions on the army, with the princely chieftain, and his Cameralist elite, or brain trust. The "upper echelons of government" planned for industry, agriculture, mining, roads, foreign affairs. Everything was geared to the wishes of the ruler and his officer class. Private enterprise grew up in a "climate" set by the managers, wholly different from the free stimulating atmosphere in England. The people could only move in a narrow orbit, held in leash to the central power. Much of the economic surplus was commandeered by the State, and the condition of the lower classes improved microscopically. That is what we used to mean by "reactionary".

The modern political crisis really started in the Nineteenth Century when the Prussians, the people with the most militarized government, extended their rule to all Germany and built an industrial system strong enough to challenge England. They posed the question the world has still to answer -- Is capitalism to be operated by and for the people of the nation, as it was under Elizabeth, or by and for the rulers of the State, the Prussian ideal?

For a while the problem was confined to Germany. But, as the First World War dragged on, every government set up a political officer class, which militarized the nation, and its capitalist production. Because the new controls were exercised by skillful management of money the people did not see how their work and their lives were being conscripted too. Naturally the planners did not give up this power when the enemy was beaten. They adopted the Bismarckian pattern of the Welfare State, derived from the army, and kept their hold over money and public opinion. The political architecture of the West has been completely altered by the long cycle of wars beginning in 1870. After centuries of evolution toward unity through consent, the Western nations have reverted to the ancient pattern of the army, in which the whole life of the nation comes within the power of the chieftain and his officers.

The New Deal was, as Roosevelt said, a return to the war powers of 1918. Many of those who staffed the New Deal agencies at first were veterans of the planning agencies of World War I. This mobilization has never been ended. Like all militarized societies, it goes on in wider and wider circles of inflation -- of money and of words -- accompanied by increasing restrictions on the creative power of the people.

IV

Acheson's foreign policy offers no hope because it is designed to preserve political militarization of the United States, under a permanent ruling class. Now the world looks to us not to spread the ideas

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Prussia and Russia but to invent ways to peace and productivity. We can do that if we remember the lesson of Elizabethan England. Government to government relations deal with power, prestige, national honor, all kinds of inflammable things. Private person to person contacts weave a web of simple human relations across continents and oceans.

So long as the war psychosis is dominant, the energy of nations will be held in gigantic combines which in the end must be hurled at each other in mortal combat. Our task is to cure the war psychosis, end the regimentation, and return to private enterprise and mutual exchange in every field. Private citizens must rebuild every institution in the country from Point Four to baby health stations, with private money, private leadership, and private planning.

We must take back the money on which our officer class has grown so great. Of course our ruling class will resist. Every program they ask for in defense, in health, in education, is meant to construct pieces of the overhead machinery which is designed to hold us down forever. There is no social problem the State can cure. Our only source of progress is the slow rise in earnings from the release of citizen energy in wholly free ventures. "But", we hear, "what of the U.S.S.R? We cannot disband until they disband." That is the cardinal fallacy. The U.S.S.R. is at war with us, as the Goths were at war with Rome. But Rome cracked from within. The Soviets want us to militarize ourselves, while they plant their agents in our officer class. Why should we oblige?

Of course we need a good defense program. Our admirals and generals can recommend what we need for national security, not what the State Department wants to implement its dream of world rule. The dinosaur State sets up an Iron Curtain for defense. The defense of the free society is the osmosis which draws people from their side, and lets free ideas seep in -- witness the influence of England on the Continent in the days of her greatness.

If Americans take up their task of dismantling the war psychosis of our century, and restoring the vision of a better world, will we lack for friends and allies? The free nations, in a world community based on true consent, can watch the Police State of the U.S.S.R. crumble, as the French monarchy crumbled, in the ferment of ideas from the free world.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VII, No. 24

By Frank C. Hanighen June 14, 1950

ANOTHER WEDEMEYER REPORT: A friend in Omaha sent us an interesting document the other day. It is a copy of a commencement address at Creighton University in Omaha, Nebraska, given on June 1 by Lt. Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer, an alumnus. Wedemeyer, it may be recalled, was commander of the China-Burma theater late in the war; and in the post-war period was sent on a Presidential mission to China. He rendered a famous report on China which was long kept secret by the Administration. Last year the General was transferred from his position as chief planner of the Army and sent to command the Sixth Army area on the Pacific Coast. Some in the Capital felt that Wedemeyer was shifted because of his supposed dissenting attitude towards Administration war plans.

Absence from Washington with its internecine strife in the services has borne fruit in some valuable and detached observations in the General's address. We find it significant that he emphasized three points: (1) At a time when there is much to-do about "informing the American people" concerning recent conferences abroad, and when many believe that the State Department is not frank with Congress, Wedemeyer said: "First, we must avoid unnecessary secrecy. We must remember the noble demand of President Wilson for open covenants, openly arrived at. During the war, information concerning national and international commitments was withheld from everyone except the highest officials. As a result, the citizens of this nation were unable to analyze and pass judgments on actions that influenced their future well-being and that of their country. There is no justification under existing conditions for stringent security measures involving denial or only partial dissemination of information of vital interest to the American people." [Emphasis ours.]

(2) Next, General Wedemeyer laid unusual stress on what our contributor last week, General Bonner Fellers, called "psychological warfare": "In order to cope successfully with these destructive forces of Communism, we must understand that military force alone will not suffice. We must reach the hearts and minds of all peoples with an appeal to human reason and compassion. It is imperative that we develop and implement all possible informational means that will clarify American attitudes, policies, plans and actions. . . . Paradoxically, today we are permitting the Communists to misinform the world of our motives, plans and actions. . . . It is true we are trying to eradicate this curtain of deceit, but so far on a pitifully inadequate scale." [Emphasis ours.]

(3) Finally, we note that the General devotes much space to the necessity of having a "global plan". He utters no criticism of current planning. But it is noteworthy that, as a military planner in the last war, he speaks as follows: "Events that have transpired since VE and VJ days would indicate that we never achieved effective agreement with our Allies concerning the peacetime conditions to be initiated and maintained in the defeated nations, Germany, Italy and Japan. A plan for rehabilitation, territorial adjustments, and the creation of self-determined political, economic and cultural structures should have been evolved and agreed upon at the time of our entrance into the war or shortly thereafter when we were lend-leasing billions of dollars worth of supplies and when we possessed irresistible military power." It is known that the General in 1942 strongly urged political planning for the end of the war. But it is interesting that in the June 1

Copyright 1950 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

address in Omaha he seems to advocate that "he who pays the piper should call the tune". He says bluntly, "if we Americans are to answer successfully the challenge of Communism or any other form of totalitarianism, we must have global direction [our emphasis] for the use of our manpower and resources."

* * * * *

ANTI-TRUST: The Department of Justice, as usual, is proceeding on the principle that the quality of justice must be peppered with politics. Thus, according to reports, the Department would like to file suit against Big Steel, under the anti-trust laws, in September. The Attorney General's office, readers might be reminded, is aware that there is an election in November; and it would be surprising if the Department of Justice did not strike a posture in defense of the "people" and against "special interests" along with the rest of the Executive arm. Therefore, various political and public relations calculations are in full play.

The Department realizes full well that it came a cropper in the proposed suit against the A & P; that the public rallied to the side of the chain. Justice attorneys, however, feel that "no one loves" the U. S. Steel Corporation, so any attempt to indict Big Steel will not precipitate opposition of the masses. Some of the Department lawyers think that, on the contrary, a lot of people will like a suit against a company which has not always been adept in its public relations. In any case, it is pointed out, such a suit would be in the courts for perhaps as long as five years -- and, therefore, sooner or later it would pay popularity dividends. However, there is a wary eye in the direction of the unions; some union leaders reportedly prefer to leave U. S. Steel intact, for they can push through industry-wide labor gains if they once get a contract with the biggest steel company.

As for the nature of the suit, there are persistent reports that it will have wide bearing on the structure of big business in general. According to these reports, the Department will seek to break up both "vertical" and "horizontal" organigation of U. S. Steel. Issues involved in such a brief, of course, will have repercussions on other corporations, and types of industry. Whether or not the Anti-Trust Division feels real assurance of the soundness and potential success of such a case is undetermined; what is noted is that the Department shows hesitation.

* * * * *

THE McCARTHY AFFAIR: Last week, we noticed that certain Members of Congress modified their disapproval of McCarthy and we attributed this change to Members' mail from the constituencies. This week, we hear that those who write and comment in the nation's capital also heed their mail from home, particularly when signed by publishers and sponsors. To do them justice, it's a difficult squeeze for "liberal" columnists, reporters and commentators. They want to keep "in good standing" as "liberals"; yet they cannot overlook the attitude of readers. To put it in a less delicate way, they are caught between their usual suppliers of information, and the customers who buy the finished product. It is not surprising, therefore, these days, to hear that such and such a correspondent or commentator has "shaded", or "altered" or even reversed a previous line of righteous condemnation of that man from Wisconsin. For the editors and publishers and sponsors get mail, too, from readers and listeners. Thus it is rumored that one "liberal" commentator received notice of non-renewal of contract from his big businessman sponsor. Investigating, he found that it was not merely because his sponsor was "reactionary", but because the latter had received a lot of complaints from listeners, quite a mail indeed, protesting against adverse coverage of the McCarthy side of the current controversy. Now, amused observers remark that the commentator is shifting his stand.

Another sign of changing times is a report that certain Government departments, hitherto rarely the targets of what the Commies call "red-baiting", may prove the objects of searching scrutiny from Capitol Hill. Indications multiply

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the Department of Agriculture and its paladin, Mr. Brannan, are to receive a rather carefully documented blast from a Member of Congress; and that the relationship between Brannan's famous scheme and Communist planning will get some notice. Finally, it would not be surprising if "witch-hunting" legislators turned to that veritable citadel of the Left Wing, the Department of the Interior, and its interesting Secretary, Oscar Chapman.

We heard, the other night, a high official of the Democratic Party in Washington remark with disgust that the White House should never have paid the slightest attention to McCarthy's charges; that if these accusations had been ignored, no one would have given them more than cursory notice; and that the GHQ of his party had made a hitherto obscure Republican Senator into a national figure. It would indeed be priceless irony if the usually clever mob-masters had created a Frankenstein. As a matter of fact, there is no little discussion here as to whether the grass-roots support of McCarthy -- or, if you will, grass-roots antagonism to the State Department -- will grow into a real mass movement. A positive answer would be unwise, for in the past thought-control from the top has always succeeded in numbing restive symptoms among the masses. But, the possibility will remain well worth watching.

* * * * *

TAXATION: One may study the decisive role of the federal income tax in a plebiscite held last week in Switzerland. The issue presented to the voters was so complex that we need not go into details. Briefly, if the motion presented had been approved, all fiscal authority would have been taken from the Federal Administration and thereafter would have been vested in the cantons. The motion was rejected. The outcome, however, according to the New York Times (June 12), was not unexpected, because the question could not be clearly stated. "Heretofore, whenever a motion, put to a plebiscite, was not clearly understood, the majority, as in this case, voted 'no' ", says the Times correspondent in Zurich, who proceeds to give the following illuminating picture of what was really at stake:

"In reality the fight was between centrists -- including all Left Wingers who want Switzerland governed from Berne and Federalists, whose aims are the preservation of the individuality of each of the twenty-two cantons. In 1917 Lenin wrote: 'Direct federal taxation would be an instrument through which Switzerland could be socialized easily.' In the Confederation as a whole, the Left Wingers would be strong enough to tax all the larger fortunes and all higher incomes heavily enough to level out all social differences, producing a stereotyped pattern of individual and canton. Whereas, as long as the cantons retain fiscal authority, the Left Wingers throughout Switzerland are forced to observe moderation for fear of driving all well-to-do elements from richer to poorer cantons. Hence the real political issue was statism against a free economy."

* * * * *

NEVER A DULL MOMENT DEPARTMENT: News dispatches from Copenhagen report some interesting and revealing oratory at the recent International Socialist Conference. Mr. Morgan Phillips, the British Labor Party delegate, told the Conference that Socialist prejudice against the United States is out-dated and he also stressed American aid as "practical socialization on an international scale".

---- We thought that the cleverer apologists of Franklin D. Roosevelt, like Professor Thomas A. Bailey, had admitted that the War President repeatedly deceived the American people before Pearl Harbor, "but for their own good". We were wrong. Here is Mr. Adolf A. Berle (reviewing John Gunther's book, Roosevelt in Retrospect, in the New York Times Book Review, June 4) not only denying this, but presenting us with the following staggering statement: "His [Roosevelt's] idea that diplomacy is a people's prerogative, not a mysterious rite carried on between sovereigns, has changed the whole conduct of foreign affairs."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

The Counter-Renaissance, by Hiram Haydn. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, $7.50. Reviewed by J. M. Lalley.

This erudite treatise by the editor of The American Scholar is not without interest to the general reader who may be seeking an insight into the confusions and perplexities of our own age. Mr. Haydn undertakes a complete reinterpretation of the character and significance of the great intellectual revolution of the Sixteenth Century, in which were engendered most of the influences that combined to produce what by historical convention was called modern times. The Sixteenth Century was, like the Twentieth, a time of disintegration and reorientation, a kind of interregnum between the fading of one world vision and the emergence of another. What Mr. Haydn means by the "Counter-Renaissance" is the revolt against the humanistic tradition, or the concept of man as an intellectual animal, a creature with power of apprehension almost like an angel's. It is this revolt, Mr. Haydn insists, and not the classical revival, of which so much has been made by Nineteenth Century historians, that marks the breach between the medieval and the modern worlds.

The great medieval synthesis of St. Thomas Aquinas was constructed around the vision of a perfectly ordered universe. Man becomes aware of this order and his purpose and place in it through observation and the exercise of his reason, the possession of which invests him in his own sight with dignity and value. Notwithstanding the corruption of his nature and the enfeeblement of his will by original sin, the impulse of man is toward the good, that is to say toward the end for which he has been created. Thus it is also in the direction of his own happiness, since the greatest happiness lies in the contemplation of the perfection that is God. Very gradually, however, as the Renaissance advances, there is a shift of emphasis under the influence of the antique philosophers to the concerns of man on this earth and to the realization of the goods of this life. The employment of reason in the pursuit of virtue gradually replaces the aim of contemplation. The "Counter-Renaissance" is the reversal of this tendency toward the glorification of the human personality. The movement had its origins in disparate quarters, but what is common to all aspects of it is the repudiation of the efficacy of reasoning and of the idea of universal order in nature. The religious phase is called "fideism" -- the denial that the Christian has any other guide than faith and revelation. Thus Lutheranism with its subjective method of salvation and Calvinism with its doctrines of total depravity and grace by election are part of the rebellion against natural theology and evidences of the widening divorce of religion and science. Here, says Mr. Haydn, is the link between the doctrines of the Reformation and the scientific empiricism which grew out of Fifteenth Century nominalism and set loose great passion for experiment, of which the preoccupation of the age with magic is one manifestation. Here is also the ideological link with the new relativism reflected in the cosmology of Bruno, in the political theories of Machiavelli and in the philosophic skepticism of Montaigne. In the end, Mr. Haydn observes, the forces of the "Counter-Renaissance" were dissipated by their own violence. The reconciliation of reason and nature was presently effected under the influence of Descartes, Spinoza, Kepler and Newton, but the breach between science and Christianity remained.

The new order of the universe was mechanical order and the new method of reason was mathematical reason. In the Sixteenth Century, however, the influences of humanism, anti-humanism and scientific naturalism were more or less concurrent, and a large portion of Mr. Haydn's work is devoted to the reflections of all three in Elizabethan literature generally and in the work of Shakespeare in particular.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED